

10 July 1980

STATINTL NOTE FOR:
SECOM Staff

STATINTL FROM:

1. There was considerable discussion at the 9 July SECOM meeting on the "uniform/minimum" standards.

2. CIA led the discussion. They insisted on maintaining the opportunity to apply advance or innovated security measures without the delays inherent in bureaucracy i.e., changing the policy paper. They proposed that "minimum" standards be "uniformally" accepted.

3. DIA rebutted in the sincere belief that if the Community holds to the concept of "minimum" there will be a multitude of agencies with different standards in the near future. DIA stated that such a situation was beyond acceptance. They believed the inability of the government to get its act together and speak with a common voice to industry could be viewed as a scandal. DIA did not believe that we should go on this track in view of a need to facilitate and assist with the implementation of APEX. DIA expressed the position that they hold diligently to the need for "uniformity."

4. NSA reviewed history with a tilt towards to underscoring the dangers upon insisting on "uniform." There was a claim that history recognizes the right of agencies to do its own thing. While there might be problems with this, a solution does not rest in the simplistic adoption of "uniform" criteria. NSA opined that to accept the "uniform" route would be to the ultimate detriment of the security goals of the Community Agencies. NSA pointed out that there was little disagreement, in fact, among Agencies. Disagreement arose only in those cases where agencies exhibited a lack of flexibility. It was NSA's opinion that Community members have a responsibility to be flexible, recognizing and adopting to unique security circumstances. NSA also pointed out that mandated "uniform" standards could be viewed as a blueprint for penetration. NSA supported CIA's concept. NSA opined that we were overreacting to industry's desires.

25X1

5. The [] representative claimed that on the basis of a visit to 11 facilities he wanted to point out that industry sought a statement of "standards." They had no objections to the extent of the requirements. No objection to any level of security features desired by the government and uniformly concurred and a willingness to comply with whatever standards the government might issue. Their petition is for relief from departmental variances.

6. The FBI noted that if "uniform" was adopted they would insist on classification since they too held that "uniform" standards would be a blueprint to penetration. They proposed adoption of wording along the lines of "uniform/minimum standards" but had no objection to CIA's proposal for "minimum" standards, uniformly applied. The [] representative objected on the grounds that this really did not say anything. The Chairman pointed out that the Committee must recognize no action would be acceptable which attempted to strip agencies of proclivities and responsibilities for unilateral determination and improvisation.

25X1

7. The CIA member pointed out that there was a new aspect in the current draft which provided in the last sentence of paragraph 1 that facilities that meet these standards are satisfactory for the storage of all APEX control materials and suggested that such language would be recognized and adopted in the Community.

8. Discussion continued for some time and the Chairman ultimately suggested the changes that are reflected in the attached copy. These were unanimously adopted by the membership.

9. I recognize that the above does not do justice to the position expressed by all members and the above comments are not to be accepted as anything other than distilled impression of what went on.

10. DIA and the Services clearly want "uniform" pronouncement. CIA and NSA insist on leeway to do their own thing. The success of the compromise language will depend on the good will of men.

11. You might want to inform your hard working group of the results of the SECOM meeting.



STATINTL

Attachment